



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.       | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| 10/771,118  | 02/04/2004  | Gloria Anne Breault  | 056291-5062-01            | 8825             |
| 9629  | 7590        | 12/20/2005           |                           |                  |
| MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP<br>1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW<br>WASHINGTON, DC 20004 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>RAO, DEEPAK R |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT                  | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 1624                      |                  |

DATE MAILED: 12/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/771,118

Applicant(s)

BREault ET AL.

Examiner

Deepak Rao

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-25 are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-25 are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/763,705.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09072004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

Claims 14-25 are pending in this application.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a method of treating retinoblastoma, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method for producing an anticancer effect in a warm blooded animal generally. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed. The determination that "undue experimentation" would have been needed to make and use the claimed invention is not a single, simple factual determination. Rather, it is a conclusion reached by weighing all the above noted factual considerations.

The instant claim is drawn to 'a method for producing an anticancer effect in a warm blooded animal'. First, the instant claim covers 'types of cancers' that are known to exist and

Art Unit: 1624

those that may be discovered in the future, for which there is no enablement provided. Test assays and procedures to determine the kinase inhibition activity are provided in the specification pages 35-43, related to CDK4 and FAK3 inhibition, and it is concluded that the compounds of the invention are within a specific  $IC_{50}$  range, however, there is nothing in the disclosure regarding how this *in vitro* data correlates to the treatment of the disorders of the instant claims. The disorders encompassed by the instant claims include proliferative disorders or cancers, which have been proven to be extremely difficult to treat. Further, there is no reasonable basis for assuming that the myriad of compounds embraced by the claims will all share the same physiological properties since they are so structurally dissimilar as to be chemically non-equivalent and there is no basis in the prior art for assuming the same. Note *In re Surrey*, 151 USPQ 724 regarding sufficiency of disclosure for a Markush group.

The instant claims appear to be in 'reach-through' format. Reach through claims, in general have a format drawn to mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality and thereby reach through any or all diseases, disorders or conditions, for which they lack written description and enabling disclosure in the specification. Further, there is no disclosure regarding how the patient in need of such specific anticancer effect is identified and further, how an 'anticancer effect' is generally produced in the patient and/or all types of proliferative diseases or cancers are treated. See MPEP § 2164.03 for enablement requirements in cases directed to structure-specific arts such as the pharmaceutical art. Receptor activity is generally unpredictable and highly structure specific area, and the data provided of the single compound is insufficient for one of ordinary skill in the art in order to extrapolate to the other compounds of the claims. It is inconceivable as to how the claimed compounds can treat the extremely difficult

Art Unit: 1624

diseases embraced by the instant claims. The state of the art is indicative of the unpredictability of the therapeutic approach based on kinase inhibiting activity. Regarding CDK mechanism, Blain et al. (J. of Biol. Chem.) report that "their specific functions are still poorly understood" (see page 25863, col. 1). Also, LuValle et al. (Frontiers in Bioscience) express that "detailed analyses of these pathways are necessary for a complete understanding of chondrocyte proliferation and differentiation" (see page 5, section 4). This is clearly indicative of the fact that the therapeutic role of these kinase inhibitors is very speculative.

A 'cancer' or 'proliferative disorder' is anything that causes abnormal tissue growth. That can be growth by cellular proliferation more rapidly than normal, or continued growth after the stimulus that initiated the new growth has ceased, or lack (partial or complete) of structural organization and/or coordination with surrounding tissue. It can be benign or malignant. Thus, such term covers not only all cancers, but also covers precancerous conditions such as lumps, lesions, polyps, etc. No compound has ever been found to treat cancers of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "silver bullet" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states that: "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Also see *In re Buting*, 163 USPQ 689 (CCPA 1969), wherein 'evidence involving a single compound and two types of cancer, was held insufficient to establish the utility of the claims directed to disparate types of

Art Unit: 1624

cancers'. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally.

Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

(Only a few of the claimed diseases are discussed here to make the point of an insufficient disclosure, it does not definitely mean that the other diseases meet the enablement requirements).

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the use of the invention. In view of the breadth of the claim, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is

Art Unit: 1624

appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 14-25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,632,820. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instantly claimed compounds are positional isomers of the reference compounds and such isomeric compounds are *prima facie* obvious over each other. The reference teaches pyrimidine compounds that are useful as therapeutic agents, having amino substituents at the 4- and 6-positions, see formula (I). The instantly claimed compounds differ by having amino substituents at the 2- and 4-positions or in other words changing the position of the substituent at the 6-position. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because they are isomers of the reference compounds. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because such isomeric compounds are suggestive of one another

Art Unit: 1624

and would be expected to share similar properties and therefore, the same use as taught for the reference compounds.

2. Claims 14-25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,593,326. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instantly claimed compounds are homologs of the reference compounds and such structurally homologous compounds are *prima facie* obvious over each other. The reference teaches pyrimidine compounds that are useful as therapeutic agents, having amino substituents at the 2- and 4-positions. Additionally, the reference compounds have a substituent R<sup>x</sup> at the 5-position, which can be methyl whereas the instantly claimed compounds are unsubstituted. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because they are structural homologs of the reference compounds, i.e., they differ by CH<sub>2</sub> group. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to prepare the instantly claimed compounds because such structurally analogous compounds are suggestive of one another and would be expected to share similar properties and therefore, the same use as taught for the reference compounds.

Receipt is acknowledged of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 7, 2004 and a copy is enclosed herewith.



Art Unit: 1624


***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deepak Rao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0672. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson, can be reached at (571) 272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Deepak Rao  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1624

December 9, 2005